

PLANNING AHEAD

Notes for the Planning Community

Volume 1, Issue 3

April 1998

In This Issue

STOCKTON'S STATEMENT.....	1
A WORD FROM THE EDITOR.....	3
FLOOD DAMAGE DATA COLLECTION PROGRAM.....	4
CULTURAL RESOURCES MITIGATION AT TWO CADDO INDIAN ARCHEOLOGICAL SITES.....	4
DOCUMENT QUALITY	5
ECONOMIC GUIDANCE MEMORANDUM NO. 98-5: CURRENT NORMALIZED PRICES.....	5
UPDATE OF ER 1105-2-100.....	5
MAJOR REHABILITATION WORKSHOPS	6
ZEITGEIST AND POLICY	6
AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS.....	7
NEWS ITEMS	9
DEADLINE.....	10

Stockton's Statement

There is still much uncertainty surrounding how ER 5-1-11 will be implemented relative to the planning function. Commanders clearly have the charge to develop organizational structures that implement the principles of the ER, while preserving the planning capability the Corps need as we move into the 21st Century. It is unclear whether supplemental guidance will be necessary to clarify the planning/PM interface as it was with Operations/PM.

The following commentary reflects considerable soul searching regarding how to best care for people, implement the principles of the ER and ensure our collective capabilities for the future. We certainly have incredibly difficult choices and there is no single, magic, clean answer. I agree with many of the observations and assessments provided regarding various organizational models that have been proposed, but I am concerned that some proposals would not ensure the best long-term capability for the Corps and our customers.

When many of us started our careers with the Corps, the chief of engineering division was the senior civilian in each district. Technical quality was the top priority and management was an important, but somewhat lesser consideration. The role of project management has since grown dramatically and is now the center of leadership attention as a key to the Corps long-term success. Although the focus has shifted, it is still extremely important that we maximize the technical capability, which has sustained the Corps through more than two centuries of change. The Chief has made it clear

that we will not diminish our technical capability as we implement the management changes.

As technical function chiefs, we have three basic responsibilities:

(1) We must develop and provide technically competent people for the various project teams.

(2) We must assure that the processes produce quality products. Developing and sustaining institutional knowledge and continuity in the various technical disciplines as well as the unique problems/challenges presented in each geographic area are critical to developing capable people and processes.

(3) We must manage the resources necessary for the project teams to be successful. By this I mean that we are responsible for assuring that the various internal and external resources necessary for a project are qualified, capable and available as needed.

As we define the appropriate role, structure, and location of planning in the aftermath of shifting study management duties to the project managers, we have a fundamental, difficult choice. The choice is between fracturing the traditional lead planner role by separating the plan formulation and study management roles, or placing a technical role in project management. The first choice is problematic because we have generally equated plan formulation with study management and because, from a study manager's perspective, relinquishing the team leader role is difficult. The second choice compromises the technical quality assurance role, creating a major conflict of interest.

In analyzing this dilemma, I focus on a few basic principles:

(1) Plan formulation is a technical discipline critical to the timely development of quality products and services, particularly decision documents. Plan formulation is the application of policy. It is the discipline most responsible for ensuring that our products adhere to policies determining the Federal interest so critical in the authorization and appropriation processes. It is also the source or a contributor to most delays associated with HQUSACE policy compliance review. Our lack of focus and emphasis on plan formulation provides a major opportunity to improve both the quality and timeliness of decision documents. Our field QA/QC emphasis on plan formulation must be improved.

(2) The synergy among the key "soft" disciplines (plan formulation, economics, and environmental resources) contributing to pre-authorization decision documents must be preserved. Although engineering support is critical, the collaboration need is generally not as intense, sustained, and iterative as among the soft disciplines, and can be more readily provided by a separate organization.

(3) The integrator role of project management must not be compromised by creating a conflict-of-interest inherent in assigning a technical function, plan formulation, to project management. There will be a tendency for project managers to become our internal proponents for the sponsors. This creates a conflict with protecting the Federal interest in project participation. This is accentuated by the widespread, but sometimes inappropriate, view that the sponsor is always our most important customer, not the taxpayer, congress or the administration. We would also diminish, possibly egregiously, independent quality control for the application of formulation policies.

(4) Valid career paths must be available to all disciplines, although not necessarily in every location.

Applying these principles to proposals that suggest moving all planning functions into Project Management in total, leads me to the following observations:

(1) We will need to have a transition period, possibly painful for some individuals, during which ex-study managers must choose whether they want to become our plan formulation experts or pursue a career in project management. Both are needed. Neither is irreversible. Some personal growth may be needed on the part of some ex-study managers in all parts of our organization.

(2) Morale is low among planners, but the sense of hopelessness is due to the desire to keep things as they were. Roles are never static, so clinging to the past is hopeless. The solution is to embrace this change as an opportunity to improve the relevance of planning by taking it to a higher level of competency. Our ability to produce timely, quality decision documents has been and continues to be under scrutiny internally, at ASA (CW), at Congress, and among our customers. Emphasizing the technical and policy aspects of plan formulation through stronger field in-house competency is key to improving the planning process. The challenge is to

reduce rework and delays due to decision document problems identified during the policy compliance review. Morale may suffer further as we make the transition but planning has a meaningful role and we can, through positive leadership, ensure it is a more satisfying and more valued function and hence career choice. Communication is critical.

(3) Shifting the study management responsibilities and careful delineation of plan formulation duties will help reduce many of the problems such as sponsor frustrations, strained internal relationships, and frustration over higher grades.

(4) Plan formulators must have access to the sponsor. The ER 5-1-11 does not preclude team member participation in coordination with the sponsor at appropriate times.

(5) Plan formulation experts should command the same grades as other technical experts, i.e. routinely GS-11 and 12, and possibly an occasional GS-13. The policy application aspect of the positions should help protect the grades. With proper emphasis and role definition they should remain valued, viable and visible positions. They are too critical to our success with decision documents and our marketing capability to allow otherwise.

(6) Planning should continue to develop future project managers. Providing the opportunity for independent, innovative thinking is even more critical with PM's assuming the study management role and for planning to fulfill its QA/QC role. Unfiltered advice from planning also becomes more critical.

In summary, it seems to me that we must make the case that maintaining plan formulation as a separate and distinct function will give the Corps (CW at least) a competitive advantage. We will have to show that we will be able to strengthen our ability to analyze problems, develop alternatives, evaluate them and recommend a solution. If we can't deliver better plans, faster and cheaper, then we will be irrelevant. We also will not be able to attract new talent to that function.

In order to strengthen our capability in this area, we must invest in improvements. Our R&D items must support improvements to plan formulation techniques. Our training must be revamped and strengthened. We have to look carefully at revising a whole range of position descriptions. We need a marketing plan to convince those inside the

Corps/Army that this new approach will really deliver a stronger CW program. We will need an external marketing plan to convince sponsors and our major customer - the taxpayer- that this is a NEW CORPS that can come up with better, faster, cheaper solutions to water resource problems.

All this fits well under the ER's requirements that functional chiefs "... are responsible for developing and maintaining a professional, technically competent workforce; establishing and maintaining the necessary systems, technical processes and environment to produce quality products..."

We just have to bite the bullet to commit the resources, starting here in HQ, to fulfill those responsibilities.

Essayons,
Steve



A Word From The Editor

Harry Kitch – CECW-PC

We still need input from those of you out in the front lines – your successes and problems that you share will certainly help the rest of us.

A word on distribution of this newsletter - We are using e-mail as the means of sending this newsletter out to the world. It is sent to the chiefs of planning in the divisions and districts and we are expecting them to forward to their folks. If you are not able to get it this way, please contact Steve Siegel via e-mail and he can add you to the list. BUT since we are migrating to the new Microsoft e-mail system, please wait a couple of weeks until we get our lists back up. It is also posted on Planning's web site at:

<http://www.usace.army.mil/inet/functions/cw/cecwpc/news.htm>



Flood Damage Data Collection Program

Ron Conner – CECW-PD

The Corps of Engineers initiated the post-flood damage data collection program in FY '97. The program is intended to lead to more accurate, shorter, and less costly economic analyses in flood damage reduction studies. The program includes collection of actual damage and other cost information from recent flood events, development of generic economic relationships for flood damage reduction studies, and creation of software applications for flood damage analysis.

In the first two years of the program, surveys have been completed at five locations including Mill Creek in Salem, Oregon, the Upper Potomac Basin in Maryland and Pennsylvania, the Red River Basin in North Dakota and Minnesota, and the Neuse River Basin in North Carolina. Studies are beginning on Pond Creek and the Licking River in Louisville and Falmouth, Kentucky, and in the Sacramento River Basin in California. By the end of FY '98 surveys of nearly 1,000 homes and nearly 200 businesses are expected to be completed. Survey results are being combined into a single database to construct depth-damage models for a variety of structure types and to account for the effect of hydrologic and construction characteristics on damages.

The data collection program has co-funded the development of a model for estimating residential content-to-structure ratios, based on the zip code, structure value, building style, and length of residency. The content-to-structure value model will be completed late in FY '98. A software application for organizing floodplain inventory data has also been initiated. The program will apply the content value model and depth-damage models to estimate damage by elevation for input into HEC's Flood Damage Analysis software. Development of the floodplain inventory application will be completed in FY '99. Stuart Davis, CEWRC-IWR-R is the Principal Investigator for the program and Ron Conner, CECW-PD, is the Planning Division program monitor. If you have a potential flood damage collection site or have any other questions about the program, please contact Mr. Conner, (202) 761-0132 or Mr. Davis, (703) 428-7086.



Cultural Resources Mitigation At Two Caddo Indian Archeological Sites

Paul Blakey – CECW-PC

A U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Vicksburg District (CEMVK), Planning Team completed innovative plans and design for a landscaped reburial site to be used for relocation of American Indian burials encountered during construction in northwestern Louisiana. This design sets the standard and has been exported to other Districts and agencies involved in water resource planning and implementation of the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA).



The project relates to cultural resources mitigation at two Caddo Indian archeological sites where a lock and dam facility was required on the Red River. This type of water resources planning action, relocation of American Indian burials, is fraught with potential difficulties due to the nature of the resources involved and other factors. The two Caddo sites were farmstead locations occupied between about AD 1650 to 1710, and eight human burials along with other significant features and artifacts were excavated as one aspect of mitigation treatment required by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and the National Environmental Policy Act. Following excavation of the sites and analysis of the burials, CEMVK was presented with the challenge of relocating and reintering the human remains. No formal agreement specific to the sites had been made with the Caddo Tribe of Oklahoma; the Federally recognized tribe that claims affinity to the remains. Further, NAGPRA was enacted in 1990 prior to the actual fieldwork taking place (1991). This statute was, and remains, in complex stages of procedural

application, and Federal agencies nationwide are grappling with the issue. A satisfactory relocation plan was essential for achieving NAGPRA and NHPA compliance. The Planning Team looked at what could have been a negative situation, and a relocation plan was devised that not only meets requirements of legal compliance, but, more importantly, all parties involved are delighted with CEMVK's demonstration of positive intent, communication, and cooperation. These less tangible results of the relocation action may engender positive effects far beyond the immediate project. The burial relocation, as implemented by the Planning Team, promotes long-term good relationships with American Indian groups, and it sets a standard of quality for future work by the Corps and other Federal agencies.

Good job by the team, which consisted of Messrs. Erwin Roemer, Archeologist; Edgar J. Coulon, Jr., Landscape Architect; Roger K. Cockrell, Project Manager, Red River Basin; and James G. Coldiron, Acting Chief, Monroe Area Office, Louisiana.



Document Quality

Doug Lamont CECW-AR

Decision document quality varies, as can be expected, per district. Likewise, MSC involvement is highly variable and has considerable impact. The better quality products are coming from districts having an active MSC QA involvement. Districts having a large workload, particularly those with controversial and politically driven studies/projects generally are in a rush to get something out their door, and quality usually suffers. Where districts have an active involvement with their Office of Counsel, and where they seriously try to perform ITR, quality has been better. Bottom line, the districts need to strive to follow the policy compliance checklist and PCA checklists when preparing reports and PCA packages.

As far as AFB's are concerned, it's been a mixed bag. Oftentimes, AFB's are called with sparse information available. We certainly realize the value of the AFB, we would just ask that it not be scheduled too prematurely. The AFB concept is really the key to early Washington level involvement and when it's scheduled properly in concert with identification of unresolved issues beforehand, it really works well.

Another observation worth mentioning is the quality of environmental QC/QA. It's quite amazing to us how many districts do not have a good handle on NEPA actions. We continue to see many cases where district's forget or rush forward without addressing the need for WQ Certification, or the need for an F&W Coordination Act Report, or many other important procedural requirements. For Congressionally added studies/projects the situation seems to be worse where, oftentimes, there seems to be no discipline.



Economic Guidance Memorandum No. 98-5: Current Normalized Prices

Ron Conner – CECW-PD

On 13 March 1998, Planning Division released Economic Guidance Memorandum 98-5, Current Normalized Prices. These prices for agricultural goods are developed by the Department of Agriculture and are intended for use in economic evaluations of Corps of Engineers studies and projects. These prices should be used in all reports involving agricultural impacts, and should be used until new prices are furnished. Questions concerning the memorandum or normalized prices in general can be addressed to Ron Conner of the Formulation and Evaluation Branch, (202) 761-0132.



Update Of ER 1105-2-100

Lillian Almodovar – CECW-PD

A revised version of Appendix O to ER 1105-2-100 was released early this month. The Appendix contains instructions for conducting issue resolution conferences and in-progress review meetings for implementing Washington level review for feasibility and post authorization studies and reports. Three mandatory conferences, the Reconnaissance Review Conference (RRC), the Feasibility Scoping Meeting (FSM) and the Feasibility Review Conference (FRC), and one optional conference, the Alternative Formulation Briefing, are specifically addressed in the Appendix. The objectives, timing

of the conferences, technical review, pre- and post conference activities and conduct of the conferences are discussed in detail. The overall objectives of the revision was to streamline the review process to avoid delays in processing the reports and to incorporate the QC/QA process implemented during the last three years. Copies of the revised Appendix were sent by electronic mail to all Chiefs of Planning, Chiefs of Project Management and Chiefs of Engineering. For additional copies contact your Regional Managers at CECW-P.



Major Rehabilitation Workshops

Ron Conner – CECW-PD

Headquarters, in conjunction with WES and IWR, has been sponsoring Major Rehabilitation Workshops for a number of years. Last FY two workshops were held for District/Division teams. Purpose of the workshops is to bring together District teams with the HQ staff that will eventually review any report that is submitted. The workshop features instructors from Engineering, Operations, Planning and Policy, who provide the students the background and guidance considered necessary for successful rehabilitation reports. The latest reliability analysis methodologies are presented, as well as the thresholds and other requirements that a rehabilitation evaluation report must meet. District teams should be prepared to present an overview of a project in their District, which is being considered for rehab. Informal discussions about these projects are encouraged. All Districts with potential rehabilitation projects should consider sending a team to a workshop. For more information, or to indicate interest, contact Mary Ann Leggett, CEWES, at (601) 634-2724, or Bruce Riley, CECW-ED, (202) 761-8597. Planning Division point of contact is Ron Conner, (202) 761-0132.



Zeitgeist and Policy

A Doubtful Policy Falls Victim to the Times And None Too Soon

Kirby (Brad) Fowler – CECW-PD

How often does the “spirit of the age” coincide with good, rational policy and -- dare I say it -- objective facts. Often? Not often? Maybe it's even hard to tell when the two do coincide; especially as being caught up in the intellectual and cultural spirit of the times (zeitgeist) will affect the way one sees things. The two do coincide sometimes, certainly, and when they do headquarters planners are poised to seize the day.

A policy, which many headquarters *and field* planners consider doubtful, began in the mid '80's. It provides for a near automatic exception to the NED plan selection rule when communities want greater than NED sized flood protection projects. Specifically, the policy says if communities want 'protection' to the 1% chance flood (this used to be called 100-yr protection), but that is larger than NED, the larger plan will be OK -- meaning the Federal government will share the extra costs -- as long as certain requirements are met.

The requirements are, in the main, easily established facts about the flood plain (see the 1990 PGN), but the policy doubters doubted based on reason. They argued for a predictable increase in residual damages resulting from the policy. They argued also that the implementation guidance should therefore require some additional planning information. This 'additional' guidance said: '100-yr protection' means communities don't have to limit flood plain development; this means flood plain development can be (substantially?) greater than without the '100-yr' plan; this in turn means the residual risk (damages remaining with the project in place) can be greater -- perhaps *much greater* -- than with a smaller (NED) plan; field planners must therefore analyze and document this possibility in planning reports; and that information should be specifically considered in making recommendations. In other words, the '100-yr' plan crosses a major flood plain development threshold, and planners must show and consider the effects of crossing it.

This part of the implementing guidance was systematically ignored, and many so-called '100-yr

protection' plans were approved. So much for reason.

Enter Zeitgeist.

Over about the last five years there were an unusual number of large and sometimes devastating floods. The floods were likely just a string of bad luck, but the damages, particularly damages to urban areas, highlighted the vulnerability of developed flood plains to the *inevitable* exceedence event. The nation's attention was definitely engaged.

Also, slowly but inexorably growing during the last two decades, and picking up steam in the last few years, has been an environmental sensibility that questions ever more flood plain development. Many even advocate removal of existing development, that is the evacuation of flood plains to achieve damage abatement *and ecosystem restoration*. No one involved in water resources planning will be unaware of this growing sentiment; its repetitions are near mantic. Whether all that's called for will seem reasonable to planners attempting to balance flood damage reduction with economic development and ecosystem restoration is an open question. There's no question about the sentiment however: it is part of the zeitgeist.

What better time, then, to change a policy encouraging flood plain development at Federal expense, a policy which almost certainly leads to greater damages when the inevitable happens. No one proposes prohibiting '100-yr' plans; planning suggests only removing the Federal subsidy (cost sharing).

The automatic exception for '100-yr' plans has been removed from the revised draft ER 1105-2-100 (Chapter 5).

Zeitgeist and reason make policy. What do you think about *that*?



American Heritage Rivers

Chuck Moeslein – CECW-PC

THE WHITE HOUSE

Office of the Press Secretary
(Chicago, Illinois)
For Immediate Release
April 8, 1998

PRESIDENT NAMES CHAIR AND MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN HERITAGE RIVERS INITIATIVE ADVISORY COMMITTEE

A group of Americans with diverse expertise in the cultural, historical, environmental and economic importance of America's rivers has been selected by President Clinton to serve as members of the American Heritage Rivers Advisory Committee ("Advisory Committee"). The Advisory Committee is charged with recommending rivers to the President for the selection of ten as American Heritage Rivers. The White House received 126 applications from communities nominating rivers across the country vying for the distinction.

"America's great rivers are an important link between all parts of our nation's history and culture. I am pleased that we have assembled such a uniquely qualified group to assist me in selecting the first American Heritage Rivers," the President said. "I'm very proud that the American Heritage Rivers Initiative will put the federal government at the service of local communities, who have responded so enthusiastically to this program. Working together we can help strengthen the connections between America's cities and towns and the rivers that run through them."

The President today announced his intent to nominate Dayton R. Duncan as Chair, and Gerald E. Galloway Jr., William L. Graf, Anthony P. Grassi, Debbie Jaramillo, Charles R. Jordan, Daniel Kemmis, David Olsen, Yolanda Rivera, Donald G. Sampson, Maria F. Teran, P. Kay Whitlock, as Members of the Advisory Committee.

The Advisory Committee consists of members appointed by the President, from both the public

and private sectors. It represents natural, cultural and historic resources, scenic and recreation interests and economic development and industrial interests.

Kathleen A. McGinty, chair of the White House Council on Environmental Quality, said the benefits of focused federal support for locally generated river action plans is highly coveted by the applicants.

"Each of the applicants has drawn up a detailed plan for the improvement of their rivers and riverfronts," McGinty said. "Some communities are looking for enhanced economic development on the river, others seek environmental restoration for wetlands, others want better facilities for boating and fishing. Most are looking for assistance on a whole menu of activities. We want to help make the dreams of the winning communities a reality. The Advisory Committee we name today has the diversity of experience to make excellent recommendations to the President. We're very excited about getting the Committee to work immediately."

The American Heritage Rivers Initiative supports community-led efforts related to rivers that spur economic revitalization, protects natural resources and the environment, and preserves historic and cultural heritage. According to the needs identified, the respective communities along these rivers will receive special assistance under an umbrella initiative designed to more effectively use the federal government's many resources. Environmental, economic and social concerns will be addressed through a plan designed by each local community.

The Advisory Committee is expected to meet in May and, following their recommendations, the President is expected to name the American Heritage Rivers.

Following is biographical information on the committee's members:

Mr. Dayton Duncan, of Walpole, New Hampshire, is an author and writer/producer of documentary films. From 1992 to 1997, Mr. Duncan wrote and co-produced "Lewis & Clark: The Journey of the Corps of Discovery", co-wrote and was the consulting producer for "The West", wrote "Miles From Nowhere: Tales from American Contemporary Frontier", and was consultant on the documentaries "Baseball", "Thomas Jefferson",

"The Fate of the Plains" and "Last of the One-Room Schools." From 1989 to 1991, Mr. Duncan wrote "Grass Roots: One Year in the Life of the New Hampshire Presidential Primary", was the script consultant for "The Civil War". He was also a research fellow at the Joan Shorenstein Center on the Press, Politics and Public Policy at the J.F.K. School of Government. Mr. Duncan is a graduate of the University of Pennsylvania with a B.A., cum laude, in German Literature.

Dr. Gerald E. Galloway, Jr., of Arlington, Virginia, is currently Dean of the Faculty and Academic Programs at the Industrial College of the Armed Forces (ICAF), National Defense University. He is a member of the American Society of Civil Engineers, the American Water Resources Association (AWRA), and the International Water Resources Association (IWRA). He is a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy and received a Master of Science in Engineering from Princeton, a Master of Public Administration from Penn State, and a Ph.D. in Water Resources Geography from the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill).

Professor William L. Graf, of Tempe, Arizona, is currently Regents' Professor of Geography at Arizona State University and president-elect of the Association of American Geographers. His specialties include fluvial geomorphology and policy for public land and water. He has published more than 100 papers, articles, book chapters, and reports regarding the mechanics and management of rivers. He has served as a science/policy advisor in numerous capacities for federal, state, and local agencies and organizations including chairing the Workshop to Advise the President's Council on Sustainable Development and the Committee on Innovative Watershed Management. Professor Graf received his Ph.D. from the University of Wisconsin, Madison, with a major in physical geography and a minor in water resources management.

Mr. Anthony P. Grassi, of Wilton, Connecticut, is currently Chairman of the Board of Directors of the American Rivers in Washington, D.C. He recently retired from First Boston Corporation in New York where he was an investment banker with expertise in corporate finance. He is active in the Wilton Land Trust and the Connecticut chapter of The Nature Conservancy where he serves on the National Board of Governors. Mr. Grassi received a B.A. from Princeton and a MBA from Harvard Business School.

Ms. Debbie Jaramillo, of Santa Fe, New Mexico, served as Mayor of Santa Fe, New Mexico from 1994 to 1998. Ms. Jaramillo was the first woman to be elected to the post in the 400-year history of the city of Santa Fe. Prior to being elected Mayor, she served on the Santa Fe City Council for six years.

Mr. Charles R. Jordan, of Portland, Oregon, currently serves as a Member of the Board of Directors for the Conservation Fund and is the Director of Parks and Recreation in Portland, Oregon. He served as Co-Chair for the National Park Service, Land and Water Conservation Review Committee, as Chair of the National Committee on "The Use of National Parks" for the 75th Anniversary of the National Park Service and as Commissioner for the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors. Mr. Jordan received his B.S. from Gonzaga University.

Mr. Daniel Kemmis, of Missoula, Montana, is the Director for the Center for the Rocky Mountain West at the University of Montana. From 1990 to 1996, he was the Mayor of Missoula, Montana. From 1988 to 1990, he was a City Councilman in Missoula. Concurrently, from 1986 to 1990, Mr. Kemmis was a Senior Fellow and Project Director for the Northern Lights Research and Education Institute. From 1975 to 1976, and later from 1979 to 1984, he was a legislator in the Montana House of Representatives, serving as Minority Leader from 1981 to 1982, and Speaker of the House from 1983 to 1984. Mr. Kemmis received his B.A. in Political Science from Harvard University, magna cum laude and his J.D. from the University of Montana.

Mr. David Olsen, of Ventura, California, is currently the President and Chief Executive Officer of Patagonia, Inc. in Ventura, California. Before his work with Patagonia, Mr. Olsen was responsible for worldwide marketing and business development for Magma Power Company as well as president of Peak Power Corporation, a Magma subsidiary. Mr. Olsen received his B.A. from the University of California, Berkeley and M.A. from the University of Massachusetts.

Ms. Yolanda Rivera, of Old Saybrook, Connecticut, is currently the Chairperson and Chief Executive Officer of Banana Kelly Community Improvement Association, Inc. Since 1980, Ms. Rivera has worked to build a new Community for the people of the South Bronx. She has been instrumental in building over 2,500 units of housing, half of which are now cooperatively owned. She has been a

community organizer for 26 years, has 20 years of property management experience and 15 years experience in private and non-profit management. Ms. Rivera graduated from the Herbert H. Lehman College and the Pratt Institute.

Mr. Donald G. Sampson, of Lake Oswego, Oregon, is currently the Watershed Department Manager for the Columbia River Intertribal Fish Commission in Portland, Oregon. From December 1993 to December 1997, Mr. Sampson was Chairman, Board of Trustees of the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation in Pendleton, Oregon. Mr. Sampson received a Bachelor of Science in Fisheries Resource Management from the University of Idaho.

Ms. Maria F. Teran, of El Paso, Texas is currently the General Manager and Vice President of Sierra Machinery, based in El Paso, Texas. In 1996, Ms. Teran received the Women in Business Advocate of the Year and Minority Small Business Advocate of the Year for the Small Business Administration, El Paso District Office. She serves as Chair of the Transportation Committee for the El Paso Chamber of Commerce. She attended the University of Texas at El Paso.

Ms. P. Kay Whitlock, of San Jose, California, serves as the Assistant General Manager of the Santa Clara Valley Water District. Ms. Whitlock is responsible for oversight of the flood control program serving 1.6 million residents and 1300 square mile area known as the Silicon Valley. From 1990 to 1995, she was the Flood Control Manager for the Santa Clara Valley Water District. Ms. Whitlock received her B.S. in Agricultural Engineering from the University of Illinois in Urbana and her M.A. in Environments and People from the University of Illinois at Springfield.



News Items

Editor

◆ The Defense Leadership Management Program (DLAMP) is a developmental program for those who want to compete for DLAMP leadership positions. DLAMP positions comprise up to 10 percent of component-managed positions in the

GS-14, 15, and the SES level or equivalent across the DOD. These are positions that require a Department-wide perspective; have responsibility for people, policy, programs and other resources of broad significance; or that dedicate a preponderance of duties to supporting joint warfighting capability.

Each participant will continue to officially occupy his/her position of record during the period of training. Completion of the program may take up to six years, incrementally, at various locations. It is expected that the previous education and experience of some participants may fulfill some of the requirements of the program. See your training coordinator or the FY98 Catalog of Army Civilian Training, Education and Professional Development Opportunities or on line at <http://cpol.army.mil>.

♦ The Chief of Engineers has issued standard job descriptions for GS-14 and GS-15 positions for Deputy for Programs and Project Management – Chief, Programs and Project Management Divisions on 20 March 1998. These have been sent to all commanders.

♦ There is new guidance out for Voluntary Early Retirement Authority (VERA) and additional guidance will be forthcoming through the Human Resources chain.

♦ For those of you looking for access to the Principles and Guidelines, check out: <http://www.wrc-ndc.usace.army.mil/iwr/P&G1.htm>



DEADLINE

The deadline for material for the May issue is 24 April 1998. ♦

Planning Ahead, is an unofficial publication authorized under AR 25-30. It is published by the Planning Division, Directorate of Civil Works, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 20 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20314-1000, TEL 202-761-1969 or FAX 202-761-1972 or e-mail harry.kitch@usace.army.mil.